

REMARKS

Restriction Requirement:

The Examiner required restriction to one of the following inventions under 35

U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-32, drawn to method of identifying proteins, classified in class 702, subclass 19. This Group is further divided into the following groups.

Linking claims 1-7 will be examined with the selected group.

I.1 Claims 8-14, drawn to method further comprising receiving data representing amounts of cell signaling proteins, and producing coexpression coefficients.

I.2 Claims 15-22, drawn to method further comprising receiving data indicating phosphorylation states of proteins, and producing coregulation coefficients.

I.3 Claims 23-29, drawn to method further comprising producing linkage coefficients.

I.4 Claims 30-32, drawn to method further comprising producing values representing physical properties of proteins.

II. Claims 33-69, drawn to apparatus, classified in class 703, subclass 21. If elected, Group II will further restricted to subgroups, similarly to Group I.

III. Claims 69, drawn to computer medium, classified in class 550, subclass 170.

IV. Claim 70, drawn to a computer data signal.

Response to Restriction Requirement:

Applicant hereby elects Group I, sub-group I.3 (claims 23-29). This election is made with traverse.

MPEP §803 provides, in relevant part:

An application may properly be restricted to one of two or more claimed inventions if (a) the inventions are independent or distinct as claimed; and (b) a serious burden is imposed on the Examiner if restriction is not required. If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions. Moreover, the Examiner must provide reasons and/or examples to support conclusions regarding a need for restriction, but need not cite documents to support the requirement in most cases.

In the present case, Applicants submit that the restriction between the subject matter directed to various methods and apparatus is not proper or necessary and request that this restriction be withdrawn. Applicants submit that a combined search of Groups I-IV should not impose an undue burden on the Examiner since any pertinent art relating to the methods or apparatus of one group is likely to be relevant to the methods or apparatus of the other groups.

Reply to Office Action
Application No. 09/715,623
Attorney's Docket No. 033099-003
Page 4

Conclusions:

Applicant submits that the claims of this application are patentable. Early and favorable examination on the merits is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

By: Mary Ann Dillahunt
Mary Ann Dillahunt
Registration No. 34,576

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(650) 622-2300

Date: April 7, 2003